

MINUTES

CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE MEETING OF OCTOBER 20, 1994

The third meeting of the CTCDC in 1994 was held in the City Hall Council Chambers at 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, in the City of Santa Rosa, on Thursday, October 20, 1994.

Chairman Dick Folkers opened the meeting at 9:10 a.m. with the introduction of members and guests. The Chairman thanked the City of Santa Rosa for its hospitality and the special efforts of Chief Sal Rosano on behalf of the Committee.

The following members, alternates, and guests were in attendance:

ATTENDEES	ORGANIZATION	TELEPHONE
Members (Voting)		
Dick Folkers Chairman	League of California Cities, City of Palm Desert	(619) 346-0611
Wayne Tanda Vice Chairman	League of California Cities, City of San Jose	(408) 277-4304
Bruce Carter	County Supervisors Association of California, Shasta County	(916) 225-5661
Shawn Watts	California Highway Patrol, Sacramento	(916) 657-7222
Gary Foxen	Auto Club of Southern California, Los Angeles	(213) 741-4429
Jack Kletzman	California Department of Transportation, Sacramento	(916) 654-4715
Russ Taft	California State Automobile Association, San Francisco	(415) 565-2297
John Wallo	County Supervisors Association of California, San Luis Obispo County	(805) 781-4466
Jack Kletzman Secretary	California Department of Transportation, Sacramento	(916) 654-4715

CTCDC MINUTES
October 20, 1994

ATTENDEES	ORGANIZATION	TELEPHONE
John Alleman	Caltrans, Sacramento	(916) 654-7266
Rick Blunden	Caltrans, Sacramento	(916) 653- 4949
Art Brook	Marin CMA	(415) 499-6752
Bob Brow	County of Sacramento	(916) 366- 2227
Tim Bustos	City of Davis	(916) 757-5686
Rosalind Daniels	City of Santa Rosa DPW	(707) 543-3800
Dennis Dunn	County of Sacramento	(916) 366- 2237
David Evans	Hewlett-Packard	(408) 435-6144
Jerry Fitch	County of Sacramento	(916) 366- 2237
Michael Harrisen	Light Guard Systems	(707) 838-0745
Alex Kennedy	Caltrans, Sacramento	(916) 654-2634
Kwan Lau	Caltrans, San Francisco	(510) 286-5187
Bob Moore	Caltrans, Sacramento	(916) 654-3626
Aki Morimoto	Caltrans, San Francisco	(510) 286-4560
Dave Pelz	City of Davis	(916) 757-5686
Barry Rodinsky	Econolite	(510) 483-1711
Hal Rosenberg	City of Chula Vista	(619) 691-5116
Dave Royer	City of Los Angeles	(213) 485-3548
Lloyd Rue	FHWA	(916) 551-11305
Mark Sucharek	Caltrans, Eureka	(707) 445-6376
David Wallace	Sonoma County	(707) 527-2231
Larry Welsh	Caltrans, Sacramento	(916) 654-5064
Robert Zeigler	Marin County	(415) 499-6336

CTCDC MINUTES
October 20, 1994

MINUTES

MOTION: By Bruce Carter, second by John Wallo, to adopt the minutes of the San Diego meeting held on June 2, 1994. Motion carried 8-0.

90-7 BICYCLE SIGNAL HEADS

Dave Pelz, the Director of Public Works from the City of Davis, told the Committee that the interim report issued contained the results of a survey taken at two intersections. These results indicate an initial acceptance of bicycle signal heads by cyclists. Pelz said he felt encouraged that they were headed in the right direction.

Dave Pelz showed a video tape of bicycle, pedestrian, and motor vehicle traffic at a "T" intersection. The City intends to install bicycle signal heads at this intersection in conjunction with an existing system. This will allow bicycles to move on a independent phase from motor vehicles. The intersection is heavily traveled by bicyclists. Installation of the signal heads at this intersection is behind schedule because of the difficulty in contractors obtaining signal poles.

The video showed existing traffic patterns of the intersection. Erratic bicycle movements were noted by the Committee. Pelz noted that there were three or four bike/car accidents per year at this intersection. He did not feel there was valid bike/bike accident data because such accidents are usually not reported unless there is also an injury. There have been complaints of bike/pedestrian accidents. Pelz suggested that the proposed modification may reduce these problems.

The Committee was concerned that many bicyclists did not wear helmets. Russ Taft noted that a penalty provision in the law, for not wearing helmets, would take effect in January, 1995.

CTCDC MINUTES
October 20, 1994

90-7 BICYCLE SIGNAL HEADS (continued.)

Pelz told the Committee that the police department had written a combined total of 5,000 citations a year for bicyclists violating the Vehicle Code. Gary Foxen suggested compliance studies in view of the erratic traffic pattern. Pelz said he would report back on this issue. Pelz agreed to post signs on Sycamore Lane to alert bicyclists of the new bicycle signal head installation. He noted that bicyclist were responding well to the signals at 14th and F Streets where the bicycles are allowed through the intersection while automobiles remain stopped.

Dave Pelz said that the intersections of the proposed study now in operation are at 14th and F Streets, and Oak Avenue and Covell Boulevard. There are other intersections in operation where the special bicycle signal head is visible only to bicycles. The next intersection to be put in operation will be at Sycamore Lane and Russell Boulevard. Data on these installations will be presented to the Committee at its next regular meeting. Tanda established that the signals at 14th and F Streets are visible to motorists and he then requested that information concerning motorists comprehension of the bicycle signal heads be obtained. Pelz agreed to examine the problem.

Dave Pelz explained that the City had performed a survey at the two operational intersections and bicyclists were asked to rate several factors on a scale from 1 to 10. This statistical study was developed in conjunction with the University of California at Davis. The University recommended that a range of answers be used to determine peoples feelings. This is thought to be more effective than asking questions having yes-no answers. Pelz said that the Sycamore Lane and Russell Boulevard is the primary focus of this particular study. This intersection together with information presented in the interim report is the extent of the study. There is one other intersection where there is a parallel path crossing a State highway ramp that would be a part of the experiment, but no agreement has been reached with Caltrans.

Action: Item continued.

CTCDC MINUTES
October 20, 1994

91-9 CYCLIST LOOP ACTIVATION MARKING

Jack Kletzman presented a sketch previously agreed upon by the Committee. The sketch shows a special marking for identifying the location of loop detectors for bicyclists . The marking had been revised from the illustration in the agenda to metric dimensions. This conforms to the new format of the Caltrans Standard Plans. Guidelines are needed for the use of this marking and are now being developed.

John Wallo presented Rick Blunden with a sample stencil given to him by a supplier and asked for any comments. Wayne Tanda reiterated his concern that the symbol was unnecessarily complicated. Tanda believed there would be an extra step required to insert the stripes. Wallo said his stencil had the stripes and was complete. Tanda felt that the stencils were cumbersome and would be difficult to maintain. Wallo suggested the use of thermoplastic instead of paint for less maintenance.

MOTION: By Jack Kletzman, second by John Wallo, to adopt the proposed bicycle symbol for identifying loop detectors. Motion carried 6-1 with 1 abstention.

ACTION: Item continued.

92-18 GOLF CART SYMBOL SIGNS

Chairman Folkers said that the City of Palm Desert continues to work with the FHWA but there are no further developments.

ACTION: Item continued.

CTCDC MINUTES
October 20, 1994

93-5 BIKE LANE DELINEATION ACROSS FREEWAY RAMPS

Jack Kletzman recalled that Caltrans' Office of Project Planning and Design had presented a typical bike lane diagram across a freeway entrance for the Committee's recommendation. The plan combined traffic and design features. The Committee found this confusing and requested that the plan be redone so that the traffic portion was separate from the design features. John Wallo suggested that a W79 sign was not sufficient and needed a supplemental plate indicating CROSSING. The W79 alone does not relate any information to the motorist. Rick Blunden said the intent was not to show a crossing, but to warn motorist of bicycles. Wallo said that the bike lane signs and markings were sufficient and suggested that the W79 was redundant.

Wayne Tanda asked why the diagram only showed an on-ramp instead of a complete interchange. Rick Blunden said that originally the question came from Sacramento County asking for guidance through an interchange from the CTCDC. The question was referred to the California Bicycle Advisory Committee which in turn obtained geometric assistance from the Office of Project Planning and Design. It was from that office that the double right turn drawing evolved. Tanda felt that these geometrics were a special case and it would be more helpful if the proposed standard were a more general case. Blunden said that the double right turn condition was more difficult for designers and that was the reason why it was chosen for the typical. Blunden suggested that no action be taken by the Committee and that Traffic Operations and CBAC take another look at the proposed standard.

Wayne Tanda recommended using a solid lane stripe for the right turn only lane, elimination of the arrow (G44) under the BIKE ROUTE sign (G93), elimination of the 4" edge line at the end of the 6" bike lane stripe, and a reduction in the number of signs adjacent to the crosswalk. He also asked for the basis of the 400' distance between an adjacent local road intersection and the ramp as a minimum criteria for having the bike lane end at the local road intersection.

CTCDC MINUTES
October 20, 1994

93-5 BIKE LANE DELINEATION ACROSS FREEWAY RAMPS (continued.)

John Wallo recommended that the BIKE LANE END (R81 & R81B) and the BIKE ROUTE (G93) signs be put on the same post since it occurs at the same point. He agreed with the 4" edge line and its continuation on to the ramp. He was concerned about bicyclists riding through the crosswalk and asked if this proposal could be tested and evaluated before it is adopted as a standard. Rick Blunden said it could be done, most likely in the City of Davis.

Dave Pelz said the diagram needed to show an on ramp detail. Pelz felt it was necessary to retain the 4" edge line stripe as a continuation of the 6" bike lane stripe so that it would pick up the edge line stripe on the ramp. Hal Rosenberg asked that the minimum width for bicycle lanes through interchanges be defined. He interprets the drawing to imply a 5' minimum width whereas other Caltrans standards indicate an 8' dimension. Aki Morimoto agreed that a full interchange should be shown and should include details for a cloverleaf. What is shown is just a diamond interchange. He also suggested that the tapers and crosswalks should be shown on the detail.

ACTION: Item continued.

93-10 SIGNING, LIME-YELLOW SPECTRUM

Bruce Carter summarized the existing status of lime yellow sign testing by noting that the City and County of Napa, and the City of Los Angeles were granted approval to experiment.

Dave Royer with the City of Los Angeles, said the federal color appeared green as opposed to yellow green and there is some disenchantment with the shade of green color. On a small sample its not too evident, but on a 36" x 36" sign its awfully green for a warning sign. Royer noted that it was 3M that developed the color with the FHWA administering the test. He said they are concerned with the rate of fading and that 3M guarantees the product for only 5 years.

CTCDC MINUTES
October 20, 1994

93-10 SIGNING, LIME-YELLOW SPECTRUM (continued.)

Dave Royer said that although the signs are facing in all directions, they will not have sufficient time to consider sign direction as a parameter of longevity. Royer said Napa County was signing for schools in their test and the City of Los Angeles wanted to avoid schools. Chairman Folkers requested that the locations of the signs, in the City of Los Angeles test, be forwarded to the Secretary for dissemination to Committee members.

Wayne Tanda said that his correspondence indicated that the City of Pasadena and the County of San Bernadino had also requested permission to conduct similar tests. Jack Kletzman confirmed their submittal but mentioned that the FHWA announced that it was no longer accepting applications as of September 30, 1994. The implication of this action is that they have sufficient testing and will probably approve the material. Bruce Carter said that it was his guess that implementation would take awhile. Chairman Folkers suggested having the Secretary contact FHWA with respect to the agencies request, but noted that the CTCDC would have to conform to any decision made by FHWA.

MOTION: By Wayne Tanda, second by Bruce Carter, to allow the City of Pasadena and the County of San Bernadino to conduct lime-yellow sign testing subject to approval by FHWA. Motion carried 8-0.

ACTION: Item continued.

93-14 SPEED CONTROL SIGN, EXPERIMENTAL REQUEST

Jack Kletzman said that cities previously approved as test sites for a proposed radar enforcement symbol sign for had not submitted the test site as planned, however the City of Cypress wished to participate in the experiment. Gary Foxen asked for clarification on what the Committee had approved in terms of a supplemental sign. The original proposal was for a STRICT ENFORCEMENT AREA sign.

CTCDC MINUTES
October 20, 1994

93-14 SPEED CONTROL SIGN, EXPERIMENTAL REQUEST (continued.)

(Upon reviewing the record, the Secretary finds that Mr. Crabill said the sign was not intended for adoption.) Wayne Tanda recalled that the Committee had requested heavier radar wave lines.

MOTION: By Bruce Carter, second by Jack Kletzman, to allow the City of Cypress to conduct testing in lieu of previous test sites. Motion carried 8-0.

ACTION: Item continued.

93-18 CROSSWALKS, SEQUENTIAL LIGHTING

David Evans of Hewlett Packard is a technical expert working with the City of Santa Rosa. Evans briefed the Committee on the technical details of the lighting system being used by Santa Rosa in their experiment with lights imbedded in the pavement at marked crosswalks. He described the differences between Xenon flash tubes and AlInGaP (Aluminum, Indium, Gallium, Phosphate) amber LEDs. He concluded that AlInGaP were superior because of cost, solid state reliability, amber light visibility to the motorist under all ambient light conditions, and the capacity for dimming at night. Although the Committee had required lights in the experiment to match the crosswalk color, Evans recommended the use of amber color for all pedestrian crosswalks. His contention was that motorists are unfamiliar with the reasons for white and yellow crosswalks. He further contends that motorists will understand a string of flashing amber lights to mean caution, approaching an occupied pedestrian crosswalk.

David Evans said that it was his guess that flashing was superior to steady state for visibility and to prevent confusion with other lighting. Evans said that AlInGaP is probably the most robust LED ever designed. There is test data out for 90,000 hours, steady state, 30 million amps DC, which show an average 6-12% degradation. Estimates now project 100,000 hours of steady state operation. Unless otherwise damaged, it is possible that the LEDs used in this project could last far beyond 10 years.

CTCDC MINUTES
October 20, 1994

93-18 CROSSWALKS, SEQUENTIAL LIGHTING (continued.)

David Evans said LEDs were just like transistors and microprocessors, they are solid state and are very adept at switching. LEDs are not sensitive to temperature. The catastrophic failure is estimated 8 to 10 million hours. There is no way to run an accelerated degradation test. It is not the same as incandescent lamps.

Rosalind Daniels with the City of Santa Rosa requested the Committee to allow the City to use amber lights at non school crosswalks.

MOTION: By Bruce Carter, second by John Wallo, to allow the City of Santa Rosa to conduct testing using amber lights for all crosswalks. Motion carried 8-0.

ACTION: Item continued.

94-2 STOP SIGNS, "4-WAY STOP" PLATE

John Wallo informed the Committee that the proposed legislation which was to make the use of "4-WAY STOP" plate signing mandatory, died in Committee. He recommended that either the Committee develop warrants to clarify usage or that the sign be eliminated. Bruce Carter advised the Committee that in 1988 it was recommended that these plates be erected on a "may" condition. Chairman Folkers said he favored the "may" condition and proposed that a sub-committee be formed to look into the matter with John Wallo as chairman. Wallo agreed.

Jack Kletzman said that the Traffic Manual doesn't read correctly. The intent is to have a "may" condition. The existing language was adopted from the MUTCD. MUTCD verbiage implies a "should" condition. Kletzman contacted FHWA and their intent is also a "may" condition. Caltrans intends to make the "may" condition more evident.

ACTION: Item continued.

CTCDC MINUTES
October 20, 1994

94-3 STOP SIGNS AT MID BLOCK

Gary Foxen noted that a sub-committee had been formed and had FAXed guidelines for stop signs at mid block locations to Committee members. He said that the sub-committee intended the guidelines to be general in nature. Foxen has reservations about the use of stop signs at mid block locations, but mentioned his appreciation of the Committee's attempt to develop guidelines for their implementation. Foxen suggested to the Committee that the word "competent" (First sheet, third paragraph) in the guidelines be replaced. Bruce Carter recommended the term "registered."

Jack Kletzman suggested that in view of the fact that the guidelines arrived so close to the meeting that the item be continued to give Committee members a chance to review the matter.

ACTION: Item continued.

94-4 LIGHT RAIL MANUAL REVISED

Russ Taft said that the City and County of San Francisco experienced a problem with traffic making a left turn and being hit by unseen light rail vehicles. The light rail was coming up behind them in the median. In the process of addressing this problem, it became necessary to revise the Light Rail Manual. The original Manual was a joint effort between the Public Utilities Commission and Caltrans but was never published. Taft presented the Final Draft of the Light Rail Traffic Manual to the Committee noting that the intent was to produce a stand alone document that could be used by local agencies when they update their light rail facilities. Taft noted that there were a number of new traffic control devices recommended in the draft. He expressed his appreciation to Korve Engineering for the graphics. Taft requested approval of the Final Draft.

Chairman Folkers commended Taft and the Light Rail Subcommittee for an outstanding effort in producing the Final Draft of the Light Rail Traffic Manual.

CTCDC MINUTES
October 20, 1994

94-4 LIGHT RAIL MANUAL REVISED

With respect to the Final Draft, John Wallo questioned if any difference existed between the no right turn symbol (R16T) sign and the no left turn symbol (R17T) sign that couldn't be covered by a minor change in policy. Wallo also recommended using the standard 3 TRACKS (W48) sign for Figure 8.9. Larry Welsh expressed concern with Figure 8.1. He said specifications were needed to address whether the LEDs are wired in series or parallel, the color wave length, the cone of visibility, the voltage range over which the sign will operate, and the luminous intensity.

Russ Taft said that the Final Draft had been reviewed by the light rail agencies and every agency had staff on the sub-committee. Hal Rosenberg commended the sub-committee for their work. He said that Figure 13.1 was satisfactory for four lane roads but recommended a larger median with two gates for any wider facility.

MOTION: By Wayne Tanda, second by Gary Foxen, to recommend approval, subject to the recommended changes noted by the Committee and other minor changes.
Motion carried 8-0.

ACTION: Item completed.

94-5 TRAFFIC SIGNAL COORDINATION

John Wallo told the Committee that legislation (AB 3418) urged by the County of Riverside had been passed by the Legislature and subsequently vetoed by the Governor. It was one of those bills that was recently misplaced on the way back to the Legislature and thus became law. The new law requires that a common protocol, capable of two way communications, be established for any newly installed or upgraded traffic signal controller.

Jack Kletzman recommended that a sub-committee be formed to establish this common protocol. He suggested that Chuck Perry be named to head the sub-committee. Perry is the Caltrans representative to the National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA) national committee which is addressing the same task.

CTCDC MINUTES
October 20, 1994

94-5 TRAFFIC SIGNAL COORDINATION

Chairman Folkers concluded that the protocol was not a traffic device and suggested that Caltrans form the sub-committee. The Committee, although interested, need not act on the matter. He encouraged any interested Committee members or members of the audience to contact Caltrans if they wished to participate. He also requested that the Committee be kept informed.

MOTION: By John Wallo, second by Bruce Carter to recommend that Caltrans form the sub-committee which establishes the common protocol for traffic signal controllers.
Motion carried 8-0.

ACTION: Item completed.

94-7 BIKE LANE SYMBOL REVISION

Jack Kletzman presented the Committee with a graphical representation of the revised bike lane symbol. The only change consisted of a helmet added to the cyclist in the existing bicycle lane symbol standard. Since the symbol had already been approved there was no need for Committee action.

94-8 RADAR ENFORCED SUPPLEMENTAL PLATE

Jack Kletzman presented the Committee with the RADAR ENFORCED (R48-1) sign revised in accordance with the requests of the Committee. He told the Committee that the new, more liberal policy, allowed use of this sign in conjunction with speed limit signs and may also be used on highways. The sign specification provides for freeway size signs in anticipation of the CHP expanding their use of radar.

MOTION: By Bruce Carter, second by Shawn Watts to recommend approval of the RADAR ENFORCED (R48-1) sign. Motion carried 8-0.

ACTION: Item completed.

CTCDC MINUTES
October 20, 1994

94-9 SIGNAL PHASE SIGN (R54)

Gary Foxen told the Committee that Harry Parker, a consultant, raised some questions about the continued use of the ____-WAY SIGNAL (R54) sign. In the past, 2 and 3 phase signals were the norm, but the complexity of current state of the art electronics now provides for 8 phase signals and the sign may no longer be needed.

John Wallo felt the sign is outdated, that the motorist was never educated to understand a three way signal, and recommended deletion of the sign. Gary Foxen was concerned that the lack of specificity, in how to use the sign, might expose an agency to litigation. Wayne Tanda said they could not find any such signs in San Jose. He said they were used in an adjacent city but only because it was an existing condition. The original sign came from the 1960 Traffic Manual. He does not believe they have any applicability at all. Bruce Carter recalled that the original purpose of the sign was, where there was a traffic signal, to alert the motorist that he had an individual movement and the opposing leg would not move. Dave Royer said that today's use of the arrow precludes the need for the sign. The City of Los Angeles no longer erects these signs. Existing signs are at older installations.

Jack Kletzman said he understood the sign was intended to alert motorists that, because of another movement, they may not get the green light when they expect it, or they may get the green light and the opposing traffic will wait. It is a "may" condition and there is no requirement to use the sign. Bruce Carter said that the City of Redding changed a number of signals. These signals have separate movements, with no signs, some signals are without arrows, and motorists are unsure of when to start. It may be appropriate to have such a sign. Chairman Folkers said the City of Sacramento has a number of similar situations and it might be nice to let the motorist know he can proceed and the opposing traffic will wait. There are also instances, in Palm Desert, where the sign improves the flow of traffic.

A number of Committee members felt that a change in policy was necessary. Wayne Tanda asked if the traffic problems described could be resolved with a change of signal display. Chairman Folkers responded that it can be a case of economics, when the sign is the cheaper remedy, during a period of scarce capital resources. Tanda recommended a phased withdrawal of the sign, citing confusion on the meaning of the sign, the motorist lack of awareness of the subtlety of a change in policy, and the difficulty traffic engineers seem to have in using the sign in a consistent manner.

CTCDC MINUTES
October 20, 1994

94-9 SIGNAL PHASE SIGN (R54)(continued.)

Chairman Folkers noted that renovation of signals would lessen the need for the sign, but dropping the sign as a standard might expose local agencies to litigation. John Wallo believes the purpose of the sign is to reduce delay rather than to increase safety. If that is true, local agencies should look at other ways to reduce the delay. Wallo feels that local traffic knows how to drive these intersections without any sign, and the sign is no solution for out of town traffic. Chairman Folkers said that 70% of the traffic in his area is tourist, unfamiliar with the area, and advanced in age. They need as much guidance as can be provided. John Wallo said he would like to hear from Caltrans Traffic Operations as to the value of the sign. Tanda wanted to see a phase out schedule if the sign were inappropriate.

MOTION: By John Wallo, second by Gary Foxen, to refer the matter to Caltrans Traffic Operations.
Motion carried 8-0.

ACTION: Item continued.

94-10 PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL HEAD

Bruce Carter told the Committee that Jerry Fitch, of Sacramento County, would like to demonstrate a new type of pedestrian signal head, but it had been damaged in shipping. Carter requested that the item be continued and said Fitch will be asking for permission to experiment.

Jerry Fitch said that there is confusion in pedestrian interpretations of the WALK and flashing hand symbol indications. The County was visiting schools and other groups in the area explaining the meaning of pedestrian indications. He is of the opinion that anything needing that much explanation needs revision. The County identified a vendor with a different pedestrian signal head and would like to see if it is an improvement. Fitch has not heard of any previous trials with this particular signal head.

CTCDC MINUTES
October 20, 1994

94-10 PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL HEAD

Jerry Fitch said the pedestrian signal head contains the man and hand icons. When the flashing hand is displayed, a timer is also displayed, counting down from 25 to 0 seconds. The intent is to tell the pedestrian how much time is available to cross the street. Fitch observed that pedestrians, after having received an explanation of the meaning of the symbols, are often nervous about the time available when confronted with a flashing hand icon. John Wallo agreed that the flashing hand or DON'T WALK leaves pedestrians unsure as to the meaning or the time available. He concluded that there is a limit to what we can do for the pedestrian that will make a significant difference.

Jerry Fitch said the order of indications was either WALK or the man icon, then the flashing hand with the numbers counting down, and then the hand. Wayne Tanda recommended that the display not be visible to motorists.

ACTION: Item continued.

94-11 PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IN CALIFORNIA, A STATE PLAN

Hal Rosenberg told the Committee that the San Diego Regional Traffic Engineer's Council (SANTEC), is concerned that the recently published "Pedestrian Safety in California; a State Plan" is in conflict with accepted standards and practices of federal and state authorities. This concern remains despite a subsequent letter from the Emergency Medical Services Authority stipulating the "Plan" is in no way meant to supersede Federal or State authority for installation and use of traffic devices.

SANTEC is particularly alarmed at the recommendations from State Agencies (Page III-4) that cities should design residential and business streets according to a number of strategies which conflict with State standards. Rosenberg felt the report should have been reviewed by the CTCDC before it went public.

CTCDC MINUTES
October 20, 1994

94-11 PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IN CALIFORNIA, A STATE PLAN (continued.)

Chairman Folkers noted that Russ Taft had been a member of the California Pedestrian Safety Task Force which was associated with the document's development. Taft said the intent of the program was to give cities some guidance with respect to the available options. It was never intended as a mandate. The goal was to reduce accidents.

John Wallo regards this document as troubling, in view of possible litigation. Someone may or may not act in accordance with "A State Plan" which is in conflict with accepted standards and practices. He feels it is a poorly written document and suggested that some preface be added to explain how it is to be used.

Gary Foxen noted that the suggestion to use markers to indicate sites of fatal pedestrian accidents has been tried on several occasions but the markers are historically not maintained and fall into a state of disrepair. Foxen is also concerned about the "Plan's" recommendation for use of CHILDREN AT PLAY signs. It is a constant battle by local agencies trying to convince people that the sign is of no help. There is much pedestrian safety literature available that recommends against such signs. He concludes that the "Plan" runs counter to conventional wisdom in several areas. Hal Rosenberg recommended that the CTCDC go on record as not approving the "Plan."

Bruce Carter had problems with the way the report was written in that it does not reflect sound traffic engineering standards. He cited recommendations to narrow highway lanes as a means to reduce traffic speed and placing vehicle stop lines farther away from the crosswalk as a means to increase motorist visibility. Wayne Tanda also disagreed with the strategies for streets and roadways.

MOTION: By Shawn Watts, second by Jack Kletzman, to send a letter to the Emergency Medical Services Authority regarding the Committee's concerns. Motion carried 8-0.

ACTION: Item continued.

CTCDC MINUTES
October 20, 1994

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Item 89-9. Jack Kletzman said that a letter had been sent to Mr. R. C. Anderson notifying him that his permission to experiment has been revoked because of a lack of progress. The letter was sent to the two address on record and both had been returned by the U.S. Post Office.

Item 94-6 Jack Kletzman said that a letter warning Ms. Noonan that her traffic cone constitutes an unauthorized traffic control device and likely to be in violation of VC Section 21400 had been signed by Chairman Folkers and sent to Ms. Noonan. Wayne Tanda reported that he had sent a letter to the retail stores in San Jose that carried the traffic cones and they have removed the traffic cones from their shelves.. Tanda also mentioned that Ms. Noonan had responded with a letter to him.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: By Bruce Carter, second by Russ Taft, for adjournment.

Motion carried 8-0. The meeting was adjourned at 12:50 pm.